

Christos Carras
 Executive Director of the Onassis Stegi
 Total Time: 13:14
 10.09.2021

The idea of a code of honor could work on many levels. Of course, at the core of it is the exercise of power, the relations within institutions, among those who participate in projects, etc. So, the minimum, the base level of such a code would be the elimination of violence, of power abuse, of any expression based on exclusion, bias or anything like that. The truth is we haven't implemented these things at a number of institutions yet, especially in Greece, however this would be the base level to start from. What is more, the establishment of a code of honor presupposes mechanisms that will deal with possible violations of the code, which should also be independent and neutral. Apart from that, though, I believe that the relationships formed within an institution, among the people working for it, or with those that do not work for the institution but collaborate with it, have many layers. So, the specifications of the code of honor need not necessarily be regulative, but rather emerging from an ideology that determines what these relations are, and how an institution, which might be of significance and power in the cultural sphere, for instance, employs this power in its collaboration with people outside of the institution.

For example, someone from within an institution might want to collaborate with a community living in the same area where the institution is located. This might be a vulnerable community. How does the institution ensure that the collaboration with the community will not be exploitative, even unintentionally, but equal? That is, how this collaboration will benefit the community that collaborates with the institution. How it will not be just a means to promote the institution, but a meaningful synergy that will be constructive for both sides—in whatever way, this depends on the form of the collaboration.

And this is a code of honor regarding collaborations. It is hard to define, because there aren't any comprehensible steps to start with. You need sensibility and, most importantly, the willingness to approach your collaborations this way. Meanwhile, a code of honor could also regard artistic creation and the concept of success, for example. Or the expectations you have from a creative process. The extent to which an institution, instead of imposing, expects something from this process, which is always result-oriented, how much freedom the artist has to fail, for example, or to experiment and end up doing something unexpected, because you don't always know where a creative process might lead. And these things should be determined and comprehensible, even though they are the hardest to codify within a mere code of conduct.

I believe that, if an institution had a straightforward and detailed framework, it would probably create a more open and relaxed environment for any collaboration that might arise. Because both sides, both the institution and its collaborators, would have the opportunity to go over it, and there would be no subtext. Things would be clearly stated, and everybody would know in what environment, in what framework they work. I believe that this can only be beneficial for both sides.

[...] The relationship of the public and the private sector is omnipresent and of decisive importance at all levels, even though its two counterparts differ a lot. The public sector has some specificities that the private sector cannot have, but they might have other things in common. For example, only the public sector legislates, only the public sector, in a wide sense, can exercise violence. The private sector does not have this scope. On the other hand, both sectors can innovate or offer services.

<https://3137.gr/when-dci-met-gabriela/en/>

So, there are both similarities and differences. One of the main objectives of the public institutions—and here I refer to the “public” in a rather wide sense, it could be the state, a town, anything like that—is to create a framework within which the private sector too will operate. This applies on a national, as well as an international level. For instance, in Europe there are some pillars of action, agreed upon on a European level, which affect both public and private sectors in all countries. Such examples are digital transformation or the green transition.

So, the public sector needs to operate within this framework, as well. And, of course, something we tend to forget is that the private sector relies on the public sector for most things, and much more than we usually admit. All infrastructure, education, health-care, without which the private sector wouldn’t be able to operate, are provided by the public sector. So, before the productivity of the private sector comes public investment. It could be a good or a bad investment, that depends. And I believe this is really important.

At the moment in Greece, among other countries, there is a tendency to outsource operations of the public sector to private institutions. This is based on a series of arguments. Such an argument is that the private sector is more efficient and faster, or that it is more innovative, more flexible, and so on. Apart from the fact that the private sector cannot innovate without public infrastructure, this is problematic for one more reason. It is as if we admit that the public sector cannot be improved. That is, when we say that we will outsource operations to the private sector, it is as if we have given up on a powerful, modern, efficient, fair, open public sector. I think that this is a tragic mistake. On the contrary, we should all fight for the improvement of the public sector, and of course let the private sector play its part from there on. But it is a huge mistake to say that the public sector is corrupted, inefficient, and so on, so we will not give projects to it. No, we have to rebuild the public sector.

On the other hand, the public sector expresses certain politics and incorporates certain values. These values and politics might or might not represent society as a whole, but only the majority—this is how democracy works, majority rules. And we could hardly imagine it working otherwise. So, a crucial role of the private sector here is to give voice to ideas, perspectives, values that might not be adequately expressed through the dominant majoritarian public sector. In various contexts and of course in the arts, which is my area of interest. The roles are quite different here. That is, we don’t expect the public sector to define the aesthetics or the content. This would be very sad and, whenever it has historically happened, the results were not good. We expect it to create a framework that will allow for dynamics to develop. In any case, when we talk about the private sector, we shouldn’t think only of large and established private bodies. On the contrary, the public sector should act as an incubator for organizations, even for individuals, that are at very early stages of their development. And of course, aesthetic innovation or experimentation can happen within public bodies, yet they are not the subject of public policy. This is an important distinction to make. Public policy and strategy for culture is a whole other thing from cultural production per se. In any case, I believe that, in order to have an efficient cultural sector in any country or union of countries like Europe, it is essential to define and clarify the relationship between private initiative and the opportunities, infrastructures, and funding provided by no one else but the public sector.